

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Interview

Applicants thank the Examiner for his courtesy and consideration in discussing this Application in a telephone interview on August 25, 2006. As interviews after final are discretionary, the Applicants especially appreciate the opportunity. Specifically, independent claim 9 was discussed, and certain changes that were possible to distinguish the "name server" of the claims from Inoue, and Mobile IP agents generally. The Examiner agreed the neither the Inoue or Mobile IP agents read on a "DNS name server" of the amended claims. However, he indicated that such an amendment would necessitate a new search. Therefore, a Request for Continued Examination is filed concurrently herewith, in order to expedite prosecution.

Amendments

Before this Amendment, claims 9-20 were present for examination. Claims 9, 11-15, and 17-20 are amended, and no claims are canceled or added. Therefore, claims 9-20 remain present for examination, and claims 9 and 15 are the independent claims. No new matter is added by these amendments.

The Final Office Action dated May 26, 2006 ("Office Action") rejected claims 9-20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by the cited portions of U.S. Patent No. 6,515,974 to Inoue et al. (hereinafter "Inoue"). Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application as amended.

35 U.S.C. §102(e) Rejection, Inoue

The Office Action rejected both independent claims, 9 and 15, under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Inoue. There are significant distinctions between the present claims and both Inoue and Mobile IP.

Mobile-IP provides mechanisms whereby a terminal with an IP address assigned in its home network can use this address in a visited network. The mechanisms are supported by functions termed *agents*, i.e. software processes that are executed by designated computers in the

respective networks. Mobile-IP does not suggest changing names and addresses maintained by *domain name servers* supporting the DNS.

Inoue proposes a method of managing mobility when terminals are assigned addresses from the IP private address ranges. Inoue, like Mobile-IP, does *not* operate on DNS *name server* databases but uses extensions to the *agent* mechanisms.

Independent claims 9 and 15 differ, in that they comprise a method of managing mobility that involves operations on the databases maintained by DNS name servers, specifically by having temporary name and address assignments in the home DNS name server in response to binding updates received as terminals move. Correspondent devices (i.e. other terminals connected to the Internet) receive the current address of the mobile terminal when they perform a DNS lookup, and can communicate with it directly, avoiding the relay via the mobile terminal's home agent. The claims recite a so called "two-level" enhancement whereby the home DNS database is updated, by the home agent, with the name and address of the *name server* responsible for the visited (foreign) domain, and the foreign name server is then consulted to return the current address of the mobile terminal. This "two-level" enhancement in certain instances may substantially reduce signalling traffic and eliminate tunneling via the home agent.

Therefore, the present claims clearly differ from the cited references in that the operations of the present claims are executed upon *DNS name servers*. Independent claims 9 and 15 each describe the "two-level" indirection mechanism operating between *DNS name servers*, not *Mobile-IP agents*, for the home domain and the visited domain respectively. Inoue/Mobile IP plainly fail to disclose these limitations.

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 9 and 15 are allowable for at least the foregoing reasons. Claims 10-14, and 16-20 each depend from these independent claims, and are believed allowable for at least the same reasons as given above. Applicants respectfully request that the rejections to claims 9-20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) be withdrawn.

Appl. No. 10/070,326
Amdt. dated August 28, 2006
Amendment under 37 CFR 1.116 Expedited Procedure
Examining Group 2145

PATENT

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance and an action to that end is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-571-4000.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael L. Drapkin
Reg. No. 55,127

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 303-571-4000
Fax: 415-576-0300
MLD:klb
60790271 v1